UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/064,573	07/26/2002	Kevin A. Heene	PU2107	3238

23454 7590 03/10/2004

CALLAWAY GOLF COMPANY
2180 RUTHERFORD ROAD
CARLSBAD, CA 92008-7328

EXAMINER	
CRENSHAW, MARVIN P	

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2854	

DATE MAILED: 03/10/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/064,573	Applicant(s) HEENE ET AL.	
	Examiner Marvin P. Crenshaw	Art Unit 2854	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *the amendment filed 02/12/2004* .

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-3* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-3* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☒ The drawing(s) filed on *30 September 2002* is/are: a)☒ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

11)☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a)☐ approved b)☐ disapproved by the Examiner.

If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.

12)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

13)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____ .

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

14)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).

a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.

15)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____ .
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____ .
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) ☐ Other: .

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claim 1 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hsu in view of Lierman, Drew, II et al., and Keller et al.

Hsu teaches a method for manufacturing a golf club head (Fig. 6) having an insert (303) with an indicia (20) thereon, the method comprising the golf club head having a front face (301) with a recess.

With respect to applicant's claim of having an insert composed of a material selected from the group consisting of polyurethanes, polyetherimides and ionomers it would be obvious to make the Hsu insert from one of these materials since one having ordinary skill in the art would recognize that each of these materials are suitable for use as an insert, wherein the choice of material would depend on each factor as cost and durability. Please note that Hsu discloses the use of plastic, rubber and carbon fiber, which are similar to the claimed material.

With respect to applicants claim of the polymer insert having a thickness ranging from 0.125 inch to 0.500 inch, such would be obvious as an optimal choice for durability as well as best response when the putter contacts the ball.

However, Hsu doesn't teach an object assembled, a base for holding an object to be printed on by pad-printing and pad-printing an UV-curable ink directly on the external surface and curing the indicia through exposure to artificial UV light for a predetermined time period.

Lierman teaches an object that is printed upon either before or after it is assembled (See col. 2, lines 29 – 34). It would be obvious to modify Hsu to have an object pre-assembled before printing on as taught by Lierman, since Lierman teaches that printing after assembly is an alternative and equivalent means for printing, as compared with printing prior to assembly.

Drew, II et al. teaches a base (20) for holding an object to be printed on by pad-printing. It would have been obvious to additionally modify the method of Hsu to have a base for holding the golf club head to be printed on as taught by Drew, II et al. to hold the object securely while the image is being placed on the object.

Keller et al. teaches pad-printing UV-curable ink directly on the external surface and curing the indicia through exposure to artificial UV light for a predetermined time period. It would have been obvious to additionally modify Hsu to have a pad-printing an UV-curable ink directly on the external surface and curing the indicia through exposure to artificial UV light for a predetermined time period as taught by Keller because it's an excellent process for printing an ink on an object.

With respect to applicants claim of having the UV light having a wavelength of 254 nanometers to 365 nanometers, such would be obvious as an optimal choice during testing for rapidly curing the ink.

Claim 2 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hsu in view of Lierman, Drew II, et al., and Motev et al.

Hsu teaches a method for manufacturing a golf club head (Fig. 6) having an insert (303) with an indicia (20) thereon, the method comprising the golf club head having a front face (301) with a recess.

With respect to applicant's claim of having an insert composed of a material selected from the group consisting of polyurethanes, polyetherimides and ionomers it would be obvious to make the Hsu insert from one of these materials since one having ordinary skill in the art would recognize that each of these materials are suitable for use as an insert, wherein the choice of material would depend on each factor as cost and durability. Please note that Hsu discloses the use of plastic, rubber and carbon fiber, which are similar to the claimed material.

With respect to applicants claim of the polymer insert having a thickness ranging from 0.125 inch to 0.500 inch, such would be obvious as an optimal choice for durability as well as best response when the putter contacts the ball.

However, Hsu doesn't teach an object that is pre-assembled to be printed on, a base for holding an object to be printed on by pad-printing and printing with heat curable ink directly on the external surface of an object and curing the indicia through heating in a convection oven for a predetermined time period.

Lierman teaches an object that is printed upon either before or after it is assembled (See col. 2, lines 29 – 34). It would be obvious to modify Hsu to have an object pre-assembled before printing on as taught by Lierman, since Lierman teaches that printing

after assembly is an alternative and equivalent means for printing, as compared with printing prior to assembly.

Drew, II et al. teaches a base (20) for holding an object to be printed on by pad-printing. It would have been obvious to additionally modify the method of Hsu to have a base for holding the golf club head to be printed on as taught by Drew, II et al. to hold the object securely while the image is being placed on the object.

Motev et al. teaches printing with heat curable ink (see claim 9) directly on the external surface of an object and curing the indicia through heating (26, the blower provides a convection means) in a convection oven for a predetermined time period. It would have been obvious to additionally modify Hsu as to print a heat curable ink and curing the ink in a convection oven as taught by Motev et al. to provide an advantageous way to print and evenly dry the indicia on the object.

With respect to applicants claim of having the UV light having a wavelength of 254 nanometers to 365 nanometers, such would be obvious as an optimal choice during testing for rapidly curing the ink.

Claim 3 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hsu in view of Drew II, et al., and Sullivan et al.

Hsu teaches a method for manufacturing a golf club head (Fig. 6) having an insert (303) with an indicia (20) thereon, the method comprising the golf club head having a front face (301) with a recess.

With respect to applicant's claim of having an insert composed of a material selected from the group consisting of polyurethanes, polyetherimides and ionomers it would be

obvious to make the Hsu insert from one of these materials since one having ordinary skill in the art would recognize that each of these materials are suitable for use as an insert, wherein the choice of material would depend on each factor as cost and durability. Please note that Hsu discloses the use of plastic, rubber and carbon fiber, which are similar to the claimed material.

With respect to applicants claim of the polymer insert having a thickness ranging from 0.125 inch to 0.500 inch, such would be obvious as an optimal choice for durability as well as best response when the putter contacts the ball.

However, Hsu doesn't teach a pre-assembled object for printing, a base for holding an object to be printed on by pad-printing and hot stamping the indicia directly on the external surface and cooling the golf club head for a predetermined time period.

Lierman teaches an object that is printed upon either before or after it is assembled (See col. 2, lines 29 – 34). It would be obvious to modify Hsu to have an object pre-assembled before printing on as taught by Lierman, since Lierman teaches that printing after assembly is an alternative and equivalent means for printing, as compared with printing prior to assembly.

Drew, II et al. teaches a base (20) for holding an object to be printed on by pad-printing. It would have been obvious to additionally modify the method of Hsu to have a base for holding the golf club head to be printed on as taught by Drew, II et al. to hold the object securely while the image is being placed on the object.

Sullivan et al. teaches stamping (See Col. 5 lines 5- 20) the indicia directly on the external surface and cooling (See claim 13) the golf club head for a predetermined time

period. It would have been obvious to additionally modify Hsu to hot stamp the indicia directly on the external surface and cooling the golf club head for a predetermined time period as taught by Sullivan et al. to provide an advantageous way to print and evenly dry the indicia on the object.

With respect to applicants claim of having the UV light having a wavelength of 254 nanometers to 365 nanometers, such would be obvious as an optimal choice during testing for rapidly curing the ink.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments filed 6/19/2003 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. Specifically, Hsu teaches the base components of having a golf club head tat is printed on.

Also, Lierman has been added because he teaches the concept of having a pre-assembled object can be pre-printed or post printed on (See col. 2 lines 29 – 34).

Drew et al. has teaches the claim matter of having a base for containment while being printed on and the use of pad printing for printing the ink on the gold club head.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Marvin P. Crenshaw whose telephone number is (703) 308-0797. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday 7:00-4:30.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Andrew Hirshfeld can be reached on (703) 305-6619. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are (703) 308-7722 for regular communications and (703) 308-7724 for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 308-0956.

MPC
March 3, 2004

ANDREW H. HIRSHFELD
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2800